

REGARDING THE RECENT SPEECH OF TURKEY'S DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS ABDULLAH GÜL

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there has been much reaction, and justly so, to the virulently anti-Semitic remarks of outgoing Malaysian Prime Minister Mahatir at the recent Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) Summit in Malaysia. His remarks, crude, insensitive, and untrue, have been roundly condemned by many world leaders—though certainly not enough who were at the OIC Conference. Unfortunately, the publicity over his remarks has overshadowed another speech by a Muslim leader, Turkey's Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs Abdullah Gül. That speech is more tolerant and farsighted. It speaks well of Turkey's current government and the policies it seeks to enact. Foreign Minister Gül argues that Islam, tolerance, and modernization are compatible, and highlights the Turkish experience. I believe the speech is well worth our colleagues reading, and I am pleased to bring it to their attention.

SPEECH BY HIS EXCELLENCY ABDULLAH GÜL, DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY, DELIVERED AT THE OIC BUSINESS FORUM DURING THE 10TH SUMMIT OF THE OIC MALAYSIA, 15 OCTOBER 2003

Excellencies, distinguished guests, it is a particular honor and privilege to take part in this Welcoming Dinner among such a distinguished group of guests and speakers.

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to the Asian Strategy and Leadership Institute for this well-thought occasion to discuss such a topical subject.

Tonight I will briefly share with you Turkey's understanding and practice of the relationship between Islam and Modernization, and the challenge we face as Muslim societies.

Let me start by challenging the choice of a word in the title of our dinner: "Islam versus Modernization". I would decline to see Islam and modernization as competing concepts.

The Turkish experience and many other efforts in the Muslim world in political, economic and social development rest on the belief that it is perfectly possible to advance a society in all fields while Islamic faith and culture continues to play an important role in people's individual lives.

Our challenge is to prove that traditional and moral values can be in perfect harmony with the modern standards of life.

Not only that. Our values can contribute to and strengthen the modern world. They can even be enriching for modern societies.

Excellencies, distinguished guests, I acknowledge that the contemporary Muslim societies, at times, have had temporary difficulties in coping with the universal developments in the fields of politics, economics, science and technology.

Yes, they have not always attained the highest standards of democracy, equality, or social rights yet.

However, the good news is that there is a growing awareness of the shortcomings and a desire to overcome them.

There are even positive steps in this direction. Today's meeting is an example of this

healthy debate. These are all important indications.

I am confident that the new generations of Muslims, the youth, have the consciousness and the capacity to attain a glorious future which will surpass their history.

Their history as cultivated, tolerant, developed and good governed people.

Peoples which have developed sophisticated legal systems, free trade networks, health institutions and schools.

Excellencies, distinguished guests, leaving aside the theoretical discussions on the issue, I would like to take this opportunity to brief you on our own experience. Our experience as a government, less than one year old.

To many people, it seemed like a paradox: A government that was formed by a party known to be based on moral and traditional values was implementing a most spectacular economic and political reform campaign in Turkey; reforms that even astonished the liberals at home.

There was nothing to be surprised about. We had put in front of us a mission to accomplish: We were to prove that a Muslim society is capable of changing and renovating itself, attaining contemporary standards, while preserving its values, traditions and identity.

We acted on the premise that highest contemporary standards of democracy—fundamental freedoms, gender equality, free markets, civil society, transparency, good governance, rule of law and rational use of resources were universal expectations. We believed that Turkish people and other Muslim nations fully deserved to have these expectations met.

We believed that our societies could only benefit from the realization of these standards. And indeed, Muslim societies have the necessary historical background and moral and spiritual strength to adapt themselves to modernity.

We believed that encouraging political participation, increasing transparency and accountability would make regimes stronger in the long run. The result would be self-confident and cohesive societies which have an interest in peace and harmony.

Our strength came from being eye to eye with our people. The big support we got during and after the elections showed our strong ties with our grassroots. Our experience has differed from the others by not relying only on the elites.

We began our reform from the very day we formed the government: We decreased the number of ministries from 35 to 23, thus making the administration more streamlined and efficient.

This was followed by a Public Administration Reform project aimed at the decentralization of most public services. This would give the Central Government more time and space to tackle the global issues while at the same time speeding up the delivery of the services.

The Penal Code, the Civil Code and the Press Law are all being further modernized.

During the eight-month times Turkish Parliament adopted there major political reforms packages. These were related to the process initiated by the previous governments to upgrade the Turkish legislation on fundamental rights and freedoms in conformity with Europe.

Through the reforms and other measures, my Government achieved the following:

Fundamental rights and freedom were extended to the most liberal standards. Some residual restrictions were removed.

Additional facilities were provided for the fulfillment of cultural and religious rights.

The principle of zero tolerance to mistreatment and torture became the basis of the relevant laws and their implementation.

The civilian nature of the administration was consolidated in keeping with the European standards.

We became party to international conventions against corruption.

Full transparency of public expenses, including the military, was secured.

Capital punishment was formally abolished. This decision was further consolidated by the ratification of the relevant Conventions.

Economic reforms complemented the political ones. Priority was given to the rational and effective use of our resources.

Having told all these, I do not mean that everything is perfect in Turkey. I believe that social and political development is a dynamic process. It can always be improved, bettered, deepened.

The important thing is to give the societies the possibilities and instruments to renew themselves.

The important thing is not to ignore the social expectations and sensitivities.

On the other hand, we know that there is no single or a simple formula to achieve this goal. We need to act in recognition of our peculiarities and different historical experiences.

Yet, as Muslim societies we share a common core that is rich and beneficial. This core is fully compatible with what we see as universal values.

These values are "universal" because no one can claim monopoly over humanistic values that are the common inheritance of civilization. Islam has made highly significant contributions to this common civilization.

Finally, I would like to reiterate my belief that the maladies of the Muslim societies can be cured. Shortcomings can be overcome. Institutions can be reformed.

However, the problems that inflict some of the Western societies, like racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, materialism, violence, drugs, etc. seem to me most difficult to cure. This is another important challenge that should be tackled by all. May be as a theme of another meeting like this one.

Thank you.

COMMANDANT OF THE COAST GUARD ADVICE RECOMMENDATIONS ACTS

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Coast Guard is our Nation's fifth military service. Since their founding in 1790 as the Revenue Cutter Service, the USCG has served our Nation in peace and war. The Coast Guard fought pirates off the coast of Virginia in 1793, engaged British Warships in the War of 1812, piloted ships ashore during the D-day invasion, and deployed 8,000 personnel to Southeast Asia during Vietnam. Most recently during Operation Iraqi Freedom, more than 1,250 Coasties deployed to the Persian Gulf to protect sea-lanes, guard ports, and clear mines for Coalition ships.

The Commandant of the Coast Guard, like his Department of Defense counterparts, is the fourstar senior military officer responsible for providing advice to the Secretary of Homeland Security and the President on matters under his jurisdiction. Also like the other service chiefs, the Commandant of the Coast Guard is called to testify before Congress on the operation of that service. However, despite the

similarities in service and sacrifice, that is one area where the Commandant of the Coast Guard is distinct from his peers.

Current law allows that the chiefs of the other services; Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, may provide personal considerations to members of Congress if requested to do so (10 U.S.C. 151(f)); however, the Coast Guard Commandant does not have this privilege. The advice received from the other service chiefs has been invaluable in ensuring that Congress provides the proper resources and legislative support. At a time when the Coast Guard is engaged a wide range of military operations abroad and homeland defense missions at home, that advice is even more important.

It is for that reason, that I am introducing this simple legislation. The bill, first brought to my attention by the Fleet Reserve Association, would give the Commandant of the Coast Guard the authority to make such recommendations to Congress relating to the Coast Guard as the Commandant considers appropriate. It does not mandate unsolicited recommendations, nor dictate the nature of those recommendations. Instead it simply provides the Commandant of the Coast Guard the same authority provided to the heads of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. I would encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to ensure that the Coast Guard remains true to its motto—Semper Paratus—or Always Ready.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 20, I was unable to vote on H. Res. 356, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the man-made famine that occurred in the Ukraine in 1932–33 (rollcall 563); H. Res. 400, honoring the 25th anniversary of Pope John Paul II's ascension to the papacy (rollcall 564); and H.R. 3288, to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to make technical corrections with respect to the definition of qualifying State (rollcall 565). Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on all three measures.

APPROPRIATE APPROACH TO NORTH KOREA ENTAILS MULTILATERAL APPROACH, AVOIDING CYCLE OF EXTORTION

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member commends to his colleagues two editorials on North Korea.

First, this Member hopes his colleagues will review the October 20, 2003, editorial from the New York Times in which the newspaper finally is willing to call the acts in which North Korea has been engaged "blackmail." Indeed, for many years, this term has accurately described the conduct of the previous Kim II Sung regime and now the Kim Jong II regime.

An agreement by the United States, Russia, China, South Korea, and Japan that there would be no attack on North Korea "in exchange for its commitment to dismantle its nuclear weapons programs" is a sufficient quid pro quo as long as North Korea's acceptance of this proposed agreement is not tied to economic aid. This Member feels very strongly that the United States cannot fall into a cycle of extortion again.

Second, this Member commends the editorial which was published in the October 21, 2003, Los Angeles Times. As the editorial correctly notes, North Korea poses a regional threat and therefore its neighbors—China, Russia, South Korea, and Japan—must be included in all efforts to craft and verify agreements whereby North Korea will dismantle its nuclear weapons program.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 21, 2003]

TRYING DIPLOMACY ON NORTH KOREA

President Bush is now taking a wiser and more sophisticated approach to the crisis caused by North Korea's reckless pursuit of nuclear weapons. In a proposal whose details are still being refined, Washington and four other nations would guarantee not to attack the North in exchange for its commitment to dismantle its nuclear weapons program.

This proposal makes an eventual peaceful, diplomatic solution to this extremely dangerous problem somewhat more likely. Just how likely is impossible to tell because there is no assurance that North Korea's highly unpredictable leaders will agree to disarm. If the North does spurn this reasonable offer, Washington will find it easier to persuade Asian nations to support more coercive steps, like international economic sanctions.

North Korea's nuclear programs are particularly alarming because the nation has a long history of selling advanced weapons to all who will pay for them, including other rogue states and perhaps terrorists. Yet in the past year, as the North has raced ahead with reprocessing plutonium into bomb fuel, Washington has handicapped its own efforts to achieve a diplomatic solution by refusing to specify what America would be willing to do if the North firmly committed to giving up its nuclear weapons ambitions in ways outsiders could reliably verify.

The White House had insisted that specifying any such quid pro quo would be giving in to North Korean nuclear blackmail. Blackmail is a fair description of North Korea's behavior. But in a situation in which everyone agrees that military action against the North would have catastrophic consequences for hundreds of thousands of innocent South Koreans and Japanese, Washington's principled stand poorly served American interests.

With this proposal, Mr. Bush is now making a serious effort to revive negotiations and is personally seeking the support of his fellow leaders at the Asia-Pacific summit meeting in Bangkok. All four of the nations that would join Washington in the proposed security guarantee—China, Japan, Russia and South Korea—are represented there. Washington's new approach deserves strong support from each of them.

In offering security guarantees to the North, Mr. Bush wisely overruled hawkish administration officials who preferred moving directly toward coercive economic and military steps. This initiative comes less than a week after the administration's skilled diplomacy won unanimous backing for a United Nations Security Council resolution on Iraq that broadly endorsed Washington's policies there. Diplomacy is an important tool for advancing America's national security. It is good to see it.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 21, 2003]

CORRECT NUCLEAR STRATEGY

President Bush's announced willingness to take part in a joint guarantee not to attack North Korea is an important maneuver in getting Pyongyang to end its nuclear weapons program. Even if Kim Jong Il's regime refuses to accept anything short of a full-fledged treaty, Bush's more conciliatory approach should win needed diplomatic support from China and South Korea.

Bush took advantage of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation summit in Bangkok to discuss North Korea's nuclear ambitions with Presidents Hu Jintao of China and Roh Moo Hyun of South Korea. In August, both countries joined the U.S., Japan and Russia to present a united front, urging North Korea to end its atomic weapons development. The U.S. is correct to enlist the assistance of North Korea's neighbors; nuclear proliferation is a regional threat, not an issue of concern only to Pyongyang and Washington.

When North Korea resisted further talks, China and South Korea urged Washington to try to woo the North back to the table by providing written, not just oral, assurance that it would not attack. Bush offered to take that extra step, although he correctly ruled out a formal treaty. Pyongyang's refusal to abide by its 1994 agreement with the U.S. to freeze its nuclear weapons program in exchange for energy supplies and economic aid raises doubts it would live up to a treaty. North Korea first should be required to show international inspectors that it is not reprocessing plutonium and enriching uranium.

One administration official said the U.S. was willing to sign an agreement saying it had no "hostile intent" if North Korea demonstrated that it was making "verifiable progress" in dismantling its weapons program. That's an important change from administration insistence that Pyongyang end the program before getting any economic help. The North considered such an ultimatum unacceptable, but it might end the program in stages if it saw rewards at each step.

North Korea withdrew from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty last year and keeps saying it is reprocessing plutonium from 8,000 fuel rods. That may be bluff and bluster, but if true it would produce enough fuel for perhaps 20 nuclear weapons. Monday, it fired a conventional missile into the Sea of Japan in a test timed to coincide with the Bangkok summit, though not with Bush's initiative. Pyongyang has sold missiles to other nations; because it is desperately poor and periodically racked by famine, there is no reason to believe it would refrain from selling weapons-grade nuclear material.

China provides most of North Korea's food and oil supplies and has been instrumental in arranging six-nation talks. It should point to Washington's flexibility as it pressures North Korea to resume talks and give up nuclear weapons in exchange for security and aid.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 21, I was unable to vote on H. Res. 407, the Rule to provide for consideration of H.J. Res. 73 (rollcall vote 566). Had I been present, I would have voted "yes." I was also